Appendix L

Display Issues: User Survey Comments

Summary of specific issues mentioned by reviewers:

- Reviewers commented that OPAC display labels are often obscure or do not accurately describe the information contained in the field. Description, publication history, and notes fields seem particularly problematic. In some cases, OPAC display labels contradict or obscure information contained within the field they label (e.g. an OPAC label for a 776 field which says 'Available in other forms' may be confusing if a 776 $i contains the words 'Online version'). Making OPAC display labels context-sensitive in cases where a $ i (note information) is present may help alleviate this problem.

- OPAC displays do not provide the most needed information most prominently. Sometimes the information 'most needed' will vary depending on the user, the material type or format, or other factors but OPAC displays are generally not customizable in these ways.

- OPAC displays do not display information about relationships between works, or between different manifestations of the same work, in a comprehensible way.

- The ways that OPACs display search result lists are often confusing, particularly when the results returned represent a diversity of material types, modes of issuance (serial vs. monograph), and types of authorship (personal vs. corporate body vs. diffuse responsibility). The way that OPAC search result lists display dates seems to be particularly problematic. Likewise the lack of additional information available in results lists precludes a user's ability to disambiguate similar titles from each other.

- A clear indication of what formats (print, online, etc.) are available for a particular work is essential. Many OPAC displays do not accommodate this need well.

- Libraries should carefully consider what information is necessary to display in their OPACs. Several reviewers mentioned various record control numbers being visible in the OPAC, which only serve to confuse many catalog users. Most systems can suppress these from public view if the library chooses that option.

- ILS systems should provide more flexible options for suppressing notes from public view. For example, it should be possible to hide a 'Description based on:' note from public view even if other 500 notes are visible in the OPAC. All cataloger-specific notes should be suppressed from public display. This could be achieved either by designing a separate MARC tag for these notes, or by creating indicator codes for the 500 tag that can control the display or suppression of such notes.

Reviewers' Survey Responses Indicating Display Issues

If you viewed brief records, was there any negative impact on brief records caused by the access level records?

All survey records had fairly unique title, so there was no significant impact. I don't believe "brief displays" is a factor in evaluating access level records since different systems define different data elements for their custom displays. I never use brief records -- always immediately go to full or MARC displays

I have never found enough information in brief record displays.

Information that patrons want/need is too far down the record. I would suggest a configuration resembling this: Title Call number/location Holdings Other information Patrons rarely if ever use the subject categories in journal records, and publisher information (although useful in some cases) is of secondary importance when a patron wants to find where we keep a specific journal.

Did you notice anything about these records (omissions, inclusions, ways of expressing information, etc.) that would have an adverse impact on a user's ability to find, identify, select, or obtain the item?

There's an adverse impact on a user's ability to obtain the item. Not all descriptions have links, and not all links lead to subscription information, nor is it obvious whether one's library has subscribed.

Record for electronic, should give information about print equivalent(if any) Record for print and record for electronic must filed together

I noticed in Holdings view that there wasn't any information on availability of specific issues of a journal. I assume that this because this is a test record & not specific to our library.

In this day and age, people expect everything to be available online. For the titles for which we have only print, there is nothing that explicitly says 'PRINT VERSION ONLY' or some such alert--this doesn't have to be in the bib record, BTW.

The phrasing or perhaps even the existence of the 776 $i might be misleading, given the phrasing of the (I think) system-generated lable: Available in other forms: Online version: One knows from the 856 and the handling thereof as displayed in the OPAC that there is an online version. To tell the user again this title has an online form via the 776 $i is redundant at best.

Why is it necessary to see LC and record numbers? It just seems like a couple more sets of numbers that someone could end up writing down for no reason.

When available, missed the publication date in the list display; it's useful for users. But, if III OPAC displays could be better tailored, we could use 362 dates, or better yet, latest issue received date.

Description is helpful for librarians looking at a MARC record, but useless for the patron searching the OPAC. It's not searchable. Why does it display?

Two records contain redundant information for the first issue (AN32037422: Began with winter 2005/06. Description based on: Winter 2005; AN32237926: Began with v. 1, issue 1 (winter 2006). Description based on: Vol. 1, issue 1 (winter 2006)). This seems to go against the purpose of access level records to eliminate redundancies in description.

Lack of place of publication in title made it harder to pick the desired title out of the index display when more than one publication had the same title.

For Acta Endocrinologica: the title index display has two identical titles and no qualifying info. Users cannot distinguish between the Romanian and the Scandinavian publication without viewing both bib records. For Annual Accounts for the Year Ended...: Similar to above.

Do you have any comments to add regarding which records you believe would be easier for your library's average users to understand?

Some notes are librarian to librarian (e.g.) "Description based on.." ; "Latest issue consulted" that users might not care about. No one cares about "Mode of access: World Wide Web" however I do think "Also issued in print" is helpful to users if they know multiple means of access are available.

I missed the full pub information, when available from the piece; again, for list display purposes. The uniform title on "Symmetry..." made for confusing displays.

"Title from masthead" is confusing to patrons.

Simplifying the description field is a good move; you may want to consider minimizing the amount of library jargon (i.e. LC Subject(s) could be called 'Subject(s)', for example) on these pages, however. Also, as with the brief records, you may wish to move the call number/location information up the page to make it more noticeable to the user.

The control records were more informative, but the data was sometimes bewildering. What is the purpose of the Description field? The data (e.g., v.) seems meaningless or irrelevant (e.g., 28 cm. - size for an online journal?). It seems odd to have a description field followed by a description based on note. Sometimes the description field seems to contain 362 field data; e.g., 14135815 says "Began in Oct. 2002." How did the control record for "KLAS top 20" omit this as a variant title when it was considered the main title of the access record? How did the control record for Lake states ... end up with an "at

head of title" note as a variant title? Why does the access record for Acta endocrinologica give one related name in English the other in Romanian while the control record gives both in Romanian? Why does the access record for Alberta species at risk include the ISSN while the control record does not? How come the related names are different?

It would be even better if the brief and detailed records would NOT show the LC control number, the record ID, or the collection fields. The first two are information for librarians; the third is redundant.

Were there any elements missing in the access level record and present in the control record, which would have an adverse impact on a users's ability to find, identify, select or obtain the item?

Description: this label seems to be used ambiguously. If you are going to give publishing history (which I think is essential at the control level), it would be clearer to say "Began publication with"… This might be placed in the Notes field, but please, please don't omit it! 2) "Physical description" might be a better label than just "Description". "Other Authors" might be relegated to the Notes field.

Yes. When looking for the records and one is in list mode (e.g., doing a title search and looking at the list of records), there appear to be no DATES [e.g., beginning] listed for the Access level records. This can make finding the correct record problematic (e.g., if there are earlier/later records). Also, I can see how not having AUTHOR information appear in the list display could be problematic in finding the correct record (e.g., when the title is pretty generic [journal, proceedings, cahiers, etc.]). Even for one of the actual examples (Visitors guide), there could be visitors' guides from many institutions. When searching for things for which a patron has an iffy title or for very generic titles, I have OFTEN searched by corporate author. Perhaps one can still do that with Access records, but the lack of display in the list mode makes it more problematic.

Were there any elements in the control record that you feel are unnecessary or confusing to a user's ability to find, identify, select or obtain the item?

Record 1: Alberta species at risk report --ditch the uniform title --unnecessary in holdings are to indicate that full text is available from Fish and Wildlife Division - am assuming there would be a link to the full text online and this line is confusing - sounds as though it is available online AND full text available from fish and wildlife division - in print full text or online?? Users do read the location and library has box, so that needs to be simple and very clear. 2. Columbia River fish counts --the library holdings information is so confusing that I would be hard pressed to tell a user what we really have! Is the copy being processed the latest received? It appears to be, since under LIB HAS, only the "1 copy being processed" is listed. 3. Lider --ditch the uniform title --again, the holdings are very confusing. Most users do not care who is providing the online full-text - just provide a link and they are happy. Having Available Online and then Full Text provided by publisher is confusing. 4. Symmetry --ditch uniform title --same comment as above re:

holdings (Available Online and full text available from publisher) I would vote to put the "full text available from publisher" info in the notes field, but then, I'm not a cataloguer!

Many notes are not, in my opinion, generally useful. Unfortunately, the two notes most needed by catalogers (source of title, LIC) are also in the access-level record and are, again in my opinion, totally confusing for users and should be suppressed from OPAC display, which would require giving them specific tags in the MARC format. I do like the omission of the mode of access note in the access level record.

I really don't see the need for having the LC control number in the OPAC display, at least not in the brief display. I can't recall ever encountering a user who even knew what an LC control number is. Too many cataloger-specific 500 notes show up in the full display. The 538 mode of access note is probably superfluous.

Combining information into a single line of display prevents rapid scanning by the user.

Not one thing specifically, but simply that these elements as a whole are confusing for the patron, they aren't able to glance at the record quickly, they aren't certain what they should be looking at or for.

Actually i think it would be better to display notes such as "title from cover" only in MARC displays and not in public displays. Library staff need these notes but ordinary users don't.

I'm not sure that the "title from caption (PDF), viewed on XX/XX/XXXX" is useful for a researcher or average user to see.

Using "Began with No. 1 in..." in the access record is better than the old way which makes a lot of people think the library owns from no. 1.

Any other comments:

When I tried to search for these records using typical searches, I really missed the statements of responsibility in the access level records (unless the main entry was a corporate body which displayed in the brief listing of records). But the ability to identify also depends on systems choices; I know, for example, that there is some desire on the part of public services here at UCLA to eliminate the main entry author from the serials display, and substitute for it the place of publication! Which would of course be a big problem if we then eliminate the place of publication from the serial record. A thing that I liked about the access level records: the "Began with" note makes it clearer to users what the 362 information means.

I mainly use the brief record in my job, but I think it's worth re-stating that our patrons really only need the 3 elements (title, location, holdings) that I've discussed earlier. The full records are valuable to me when I need to troubleshoot why a patron can't find a particular title, however, so I appreciate the work you're doing to simplify them. I guess I

would like to see the brief records be designed for the patron, and the more detailed records be the ones that we librarians design for ourselves. Patrons rarely (if ever) use, or need to use, the full and/or MARC records so we should make a concerted effort to ensure that we provide them with the information they need in a clear and concise manner that minimizes the amount of 'library lingo' that we use. Making the full/MARC displays more librarian friendly (and you already do an excellent job of that!) also makes my job a lot easier. Thanks for the hard work and getting my input on this!

We are VERY inconsistent in how we display format (especially electronic format) in the short form of a record. I don't know if this proposal helps to remedy that situation but I sure hope that it does.